

Application No.: 09/751,761  
Amendment dated: August 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated: June 17, 2005

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-19 were pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-19 have been cancelled. Claims 20-38 have been added.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-11, 14, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,803 (hereinafter "Swoboda") in view of Mandyam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,285,974 (hereinafter "Mandyam"). Claims 2, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam in further view of Sato, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,768 (hereinafter "Sato"). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam in further view of Hennessy and Patterson, Computer Organization and Design, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1998 (hereinafter "Hennessy").

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 5-7, 10-11, 14, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam. Swoboda generally discloses emulation and debug circuitry that can be incorporated into a variety of digital systems (*See Abstract*). Mandyam discloses detecting architectural violations in a multiprocessor computer system using a random test generator (*See Abstract*). Neither Swoboda, nor Mandyam, nor any combination thereof discloses detecting a stall in said execution stage, as recited by claims 20, 26, and 33. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that elements of claim 20, 26, and 33 are neither shown nor suggested by the cited reference. Claims 21-25, 27-32, and 34-38 depend from claims 20, 26, and 33, respectively.

Application No.: 09/751,761  
Amendment dated: August 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated: June 17, 2005

Claims 2, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam in further view of Sato. Sato discloses a pipelined microprocessor capable of avoiding pipeline stalls (*See Abstract*). One of the disclosed methods is by inserting a NOP operation into the pipeline (*See Sato, Col. 2, Lines 4-14*). Neither Swoboda, Sato, Mandyam nor any combination thereof discloses detecting a stall in said execution stage, as recited by claims 20, 26, and 33.

Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam in further view of Hennessy. Hennessy is a computer textbook that discloses AND and OR operations. Neither Swoboda, Mandyam, Hennessy, nor any combination thereof discloses detecting a stall in said execution stage, as recited by claims 20, 26, and 33.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that elements of claim 20, 26, and 33 are neither shown nor suggested by the cited references. Claims 21-25, 27-32, and 34-38 depend from claims 20, 26, and 33, respectively. Accordingly claims 20-38 are allowable over the art cited under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Application No.: 09/751,761  
Amendment dated: August 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated: June 17, 2005

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: August 17, 2005

By: Stephen T. Neal  
Stephen T. Neal  
(Reg. No. 47,815)  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501